

Remarks/Arguments

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Final Office Action of September 12, 2007.

Claims 1-9, 11-25, 27-42, 44-60, and 62-68 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Final Office Action. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-25, 27-42, 44-60, and 62-68.

In addition, in another Office Action of June 20, 2007 for the co-pending application, 10/786,627, claims 18, 30 and 31 in the copending application, 10/786,627, are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-32 of the present patent application.

The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 34, and 51 and cancels claims 7, 24, 30-32, 40, 57, and 68, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-23, 25, 27-29, 33-39, 41-42, 44-56, 58-60, and 62-67. Applicant hereby respectfully reserves the right to continue prosecuting the canceled claims if necessary. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claim 1, 2, 7, 9, 13-19, 24, 29-34, 35, 40, 42, 46-52, 57, 59, 60, 63-68 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anuff.

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to state as “*wherein the portal operates to include a desktop and associated desktop resource that includes at least one of the following portal resources a book, a page, a portlet, a shell, a look & feel, and a layout.*” A portal provides a way to aggregate content and integrates applications, allowing a visitor to access everything via a user interface. Paragraph [0037], Line 2-5. It is the collection of components that makes up a portal. A desktop can be a special view of portal, allowing for variations based on the characteristics of a visitor to a site. Thus, a desktop is a portal or part of a portal. Paragraph [0037], Line 11-15. Applicant respectfully submits that Anuff fails to teach the desktop that is associated with desktop resources.

Sollenberger discloses an entirely different “desktop” from the present invention. In Sollenberger, a desktop is an application that is used to access the information from the corporate

network that is comparable but distinguishable from a web browser. Paragraph [0005], Line 8-16. Such an application is not a portal or part of a portal.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is in allowable condition since the present invention can not be anticipated by the prior art. Hence, dependent claims 2, 9 and 13-17 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should also be in allowable condition.

In addition, the same amendment is applied to independent claims 18, 34, 51 and 68. Therefore, at least for the same reason as stated above, claims 18, 34, and 51 should all be in allowable condition. Hence, dependent claims 19 and 29, which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 35, 42, 46-50, which are based on allowable independent claim 34; and dependent claims 52, 59, 60, 63-67, which are based on allowable independent claim 51 should all be in allowable condition.

B. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 4, 5, 11, 20, 21, 22, 27, 36, 37, 38, 44, 53, 54, 55 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff in view of Sollenberger.

Here, dependent claims 3, 4, 5, and 11, which are based on allowable independent claim 1; dependent claims 20, 21, 22, and 27, which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 36, 37, 38, and 44, which are based on allowable independent claim 34; and dependent claims 53, 54, and 55, which are based on allowable independent claim 51 should all be in allowable condition.

C. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09-18-2007

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800